

***Village of Barrington***  
***Architectural Review Commission***  
Minutes Summary

Date: September 8, 2005

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room  
200 South Hough Street  
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Karen Plummer, Acting Chairperson  
Stephen Petersen, Commissioner  
Marty O'Donnell, Commissioner  
Mimi Troy, Commissioner

Staff Members: Jim Wallace, Director

***Call to Order***

Ms. Plummer called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The Roll Call noted the following: John Julian III, absent; Joseph Coath, absent; Stephen Petersen, present; Karen Plummer, present; Marty O'Donnell, present; Mimi Troy, present; Lisa McCauley, absent. There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

***Old Business***

**ARC 05-15:** Marcan Residence, 516 South Grove Avenue (Public Hearing – Historic) (Continued from August 25, 2005).

**Petitioner:** Kenneth Marcan, owner

Ms. Plummer swore in the petitioner.

The petitioner is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for an alteration to a property in the H Historic Preservation Overlay District. The petitioner is proposing to construct a two-story addition on the south and west (rear) side of the existing home, attach the existing detached garage, and reconstruct the existing porch. The property is zoned R-6 Single Family Residential and is in the H Historic Preservation Overlay District. Mr. Marcan brought in window, brick and cedar siding and shingle samples for the Commission's review.

Mr. Wallace noted that a list of requests from the petitioner were included in the packet. Mr. Wallace asked the Commission if they would like him to read the list aloud followed by ARC discussion.

Ms. Plummer asked the petitioner if he had any additional questions.

Mr. Marchan mentioned that he would like to get direction on his request to remove the stucco from the house.

Mr. Wallace stated that this request is listed on the report. Mr. Wallace stated that he will read ARC's comments from the July 28, 2005 meeting and then read Mr. Marchan's request.

1. The ARC noted that the drawings that were presented were difficult to read. Professional drawings are required for final ARC approval. *The petitioner has not provided professional drawings. Staff met with the petitioner to discuss this issue, and other unresolved issues of the petition. The petitioner indicated that he does not want to hire an architect to create professional drawings until he knows which basic building shapes, details and methods are recommended or approved by the ARC. Consequently, the petitioner has submitted revised drawings and a cover sheet, in an attempt to isolate and resolve basic issues prior to a final hearing at a later date. Therefore, the ARC should treat the resubmittal as preliminary, for purposes of providing the petitioner with further direction. Once direction is received, the petitioner will have appropriate professional drawings executed as necessary.*
2. Drawings should include consistent building details such as eave and cornice details, materials, muntin patterns, window sizes, etc. *The petitioner's plans show more detail and consistency, but are still preliminary and not professionally drawn. Later in this report, staff has identified specific detail items to be reviewed.*
3. The shallow gable on the south elevation is not appropriate. *The petitioner has revised the gable to an 8:12 pitch. See Sheet 5 of the plans.*
4. The rooflines should be simplified and the overall roof mass of the building should be explored. The ARC noted that a roof plan may be helpful to help understand the roof massing. *Sheet 8 of the plans is a Roof Plan. Note also that Sheet 5 of the plans shows a partial roof plan in comparison with the south (left side) elevation. With the exception of the two dormers placed on the south (left) elevation in response to Comment #5 below, the roof appears to be somewhat simplified. The overall mass of the roof is more apparent from the side elevations than from the front, and is moderately reduced through the use of the two gabled dormers.*
5. The ARC stated that the original portion house establishes the massing and the scale for the addition. The original portion of the home is a one and one-half story structure. The ARC encourages keeping the new addition within this scale. The ARC recommended that lowering the plate height and increasing the roof pitch may help the petitioner gain more floor area while maintaining the overall mass and scale. Additionally, dormers may be an appropriate method to increase floor area and should be explored. *The petitioner has lowered the plate height and utilized dormers as suggested.*
6. The original features of the front porch should be preserved rather than replaced. The stucco on the porch should be maintained and restored. *The petitioner has investigated the porch and found that the closed railings were not original to the house and were not stucco (they are T-111 plywood siding). The petitioner requests that an open railing be allowed. See Detail Sheets 3, 4 and 5 for preliminary designs and options for the porch and railings. Specific questions and options will be further delineated later in this report.*  
The ARC believes that the original house was stucco based on the window casings and detailing. The original exterior siding material should be restored rather than replaced. The ARC noted that lap siding on the rear addition may be appropriate. *The petitioner has carefully removed the aluminum siding to expose the original stucco. The petitioner feels that the installation of the siding over the stucco has damaged the stucco to the extent that repair is not a desired approach. The stucco issue is discussed in detail later in this report.*
7. The window openings in the sunroom should be smaller. *The petitioner has reduced the size of the window openings in the sunroom.*
8. The ARC recommends maintaining the overall existing fenestration on the original portion of the structure; however, some modifications may be appropriate. *The petitioner proposes to establish somewhat modified window trims (see Detail Sheet 7). The petitioner proposes to switch the locations of the existing front door and front window (see Plan Sheet 4) and relocate a second story window on the right side of the house to center it under the gable (see Plan Sheet 6). Overall, the petitioner is requesting to replace the remaining windows with*

*Marvin SDL windows, as will be used in the addition. This will be addressed later in this report.*

9. All materials samples and details shall be presented to the ARC for approval. The revised drawings shall indicate detail, window and siding materials. *The petitioner proposes to use a combination of 1x6 cedar lap siding with a 4" exposure and wood shingles in some gables (see Plan Sheets 4, 5 and 6 and Detail Sheets 3, 9 and 10). Details of the siding profile are not provided at this time. Windows are proposed to be Marvin SDL windows (see Detail Sheets 13, 14 and 15). The petitioner has indicated that material samples will be brought to the meeting.*

Mr. Wallace then read a summary of the request from the petitioner with staff's comments.

1. Trellis between house and garage: *This is depicted on Detail Sheet 6 and Plan Sheet 4. The petitioner proposes to build the trellis supports as depicted on Plan Sheet 4. The ARC should give direction on whether or not the trellis is appropriate and whether or not further detail drawings will be required.*
2. Garage siding, frieze and dentil details: *See Detail Sheets 8 and 10 and Plan Sheet. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness of replacing the garage siding and utilizing (throughout the addition) the trim detail, and whether or not further details are required.*
3. Garage door: *The ARC should comment on whether or not it believes the proposed door (Detail Sheet 11) is appropriate. Please note that two situations are depicted on Plan Sheet 4: the left side shows the current garage door and the right side shows the proposed door. The petitioner requests ARC's approval of paint color. Note that such approval is not required under the current regulations.*
4. Front porch posts: *See Detail Sheets 3 and 5 and Plan Sheet 4. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness of the proposed columns and whether or not further details are required.*
5. Front door: *See Detail Sheet 12. The petitioner proposes to replace (and relocate) the front door (6-lite French door not original to the house) with a Therma-Tru (composite fiber) door. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness the door and whether or not further details are required.*
6. Switch front door and window: *See Plan Sheet 4. The petitioner proposes to switch the locations of the existing door and window and to replace all the existing windows with new windows as shown in Detail Sheets 13-15. The petitioner believes it will be awkward to leave a few original windows in a structure that will have mostly new windows. There are six original casement windows on the house. All are in fair or good condition. There is also a fixed window on the front wall in the porch area. It is oriented in a "clerestory" position. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness of switching the front door and window locations, and on the appropriateness of replacing the existing windows. The ARC should also comment on the appropriateness of the window chosen for the new windows.*
7. Front porch roof: *See Detail Sheet 3 and Plan Sheet 4. The petitioner proposes to leave the existing porch roof support brackets in place and not utilize the dentil trim method proposed for the addition (and existing house, per Question 15 below). The petitioner further proposes to add wood shingles to the front gable portion of the porch roof, to match the detail proposed for several gables of the addition. The front porch gable is currently finished with bead boards, as is the porch ceiling. Due to the roof pitch, finishes and trim details, it is likely that the porch is not original, though the ARC should consider whether or not it has acquired significance. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness of leaving the existing support brackets and installing wood shingles in the gable, and whether or not further details are required. The ceiling situation for the front porch also needs to be clarified. Detail Sheet 5 depicts a stain color proposed for a "new" bead board porch ceiling. The porch currently*

*has a bead board ceiling. The bead board is approximately ½" x 4" boards. Two or three pieces have been removed. The ARC should clarify whether or not the petitioner intends to remove all of the bead board and if so, whether or not this is appropriate, and whether or not further details are required.*

8. Add window in second story, over porch: *See Plan Sheet 4. The petitioner believes the ARC previously suggested this, in order to balance the appearance of the front elevation of the house. The petitioner proposes a Marvin WCM 1632-2W in this area, and also proposes to replace the similar window on the left side with this type of window. It is not clear from the materials presented what type and materials this window is. The petitioner has indicated that window samples will be brought to the meeting. The ARC should determine exactly what type and materials of window is proposed. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness of the proposed window, the appropriateness of replacing the window on the left side, and whether or not further details are required.*
9. Move upper level window: *See Plan Sheet 6. The petitioner proposes to move a window in the right side gable area, to the center of the gable. The petitioner further proposes to replace the existing window with a new WCM 1660-2W window. It is not clear from the materials submitted what type or materials this window is. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness of moving the window, the appropriateness of replacing the window, the appropriateness of the type and materials of proposed replacement window, and whether or not further details are required.*
10. Remove closed front porch railing and replace with open railing: *Please note this is the same as Item #1 of "Cover Letter Regarding Demolition Work", which provides a description and the petitioner's reasoning for the proposal. See Detail Sheets 3 and 4 and Plan Sheets 4 and 6. The petitioner has investigated and discovered that the existing front porch knee wall was not original to the house, did not have a stucco finish, and is rotting. He proposes to remove the walls and replace them with new columns as discussed in Question 4 above and new open railings as depicted in the Detail Sheets. Please also note that an optional turned baluster detail is presented on Detail Sheet 5. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness of removing the walls and replacing them with the proposed railings, which option the ARC prefers (square or turned) and whether or not further details are required.*
11. Remove all stucco and replace with 1x6 cedar lap siding: *This is also Item #2 of the "Cover Letter Regarding Demolition Work". Please see the petitioner's comments in the letter. Staff inspected the site and does not feel comfortable making a recommendation with regard to removal versus restoration of the stucco. Staff notes the following conditions relevant to the stucco:*
  - *There are nails throughout the surface of the stucco (from the aluminum siding) at approx. 16" centers. They will have to be removed and the stucco patched.*
  - *Stucco was previously removed from a second story rim joist area and patched with plywood roughly flush with the finished stucco surface.*
  - *Patching and repairs are needed at the soffit edges of the left side shed addition and there is an area of missing stucco at the bottom of the left wall of the shed addition*
  - *Stucco has been chiseled out in an area in the front porch for an electrical cable installation.*
  - *Patching and repairs will be needed at most window areas.*
  - *The stucco is generally adhering well to the wall and appears sound (with the exceptions noted above).*

*The petitioner has been advised that ARC members may visit the site to inspect the stucco prior to the meeting. Staff encourages members to do so. The ARC should decide if repair and restoration of the stucco is feasible and desirable.*

12. Roof of dining room bay: See Detail Sheet 8 and Plan Sheet 4 and 5. The petitioner proposes to shingle this bay roof but would like to have approval for a standing-seam copper roof as an option. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness of the shingles and the copper option, and whether or not further details are required.
13. Addition roof: See Plan Sheets 5, 6, 7 and 8. The petitioner believes the proposed roof mass, lowered late height and dormers respond to the ARC's previous comments. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness of roof plan, and whether or not further details are required. The ARC should generally comment on whether or not the overall massing of the addition is now appropriate.
14. Wood shingles in new gables: See Plan Sheets 5 and 6. Note that this item is related to Item 7 above. The petitioner proposes to shingle gable portions of the addition as shown. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness of this style, and whether or not further details are required.
15. Frieze, soffit and dentil details: See Detail Sheets 8 and 10 and Plan Sheets 4, 5 and 7. The petitioner proposes this frieze and dentil detail for the garage and addition. The petitioner proposes to use angled rather than horizontal soffits, and the soffits are proposed to be enclosed rather than open. The frieze below the soffit is proposed to have dentils. Note that the plans show a 1x6 frieze on the garage rather than 1x8 as is on the house. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness of the proposed dentil detail, should clarify if 1x6 or 1x8 is preferred for the garage frieze, and whether or not further details are required.
16. Gutters and downspouts: See detail Sheet 3. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness of installing copper gutters and downspouts as proposed, and whether or not further details are required.
17. Crown at rake frieze/fascia: See Detail Sheet 3 and Plan Sheets 5 and 6. The plans make it difficult to discern where the crown is intended (frieze or fascia or both). The ARC should work with the petitioner to clarify where the use of crown is intended, where it would be appropriate, and whether or not further details are required.
18. Trellis at rear balcony: See Detail Sheet 6 (upper right photo) and Plan Sheets 6, 7 and 8. Note that the petitioner does not propose to use the post detail on Detail Sheet 6, but proposes a post similar to the proposed front porch post shown in Detail Sheets 3 and 5. The ARC should comment on the appropriateness of the trellis and posts proposed, and whether or not further details are required.
19. Remove and replace six original windows on house: Please note this is the same as Item #3 of the "Cover Letter Regarding Demolition Work". The issue of window replacement is addressed in Item 6 above.

Ms. Plummer suggested that the Commission first discuss the massing of the addition as well as the new rooflines.

Mr. O'Donnell felt that the revised plan has dramatically improved.

Ms. Troy noted that the dormers and the 8:12 roof slopes are an improvement. She also felt that the south elevation proposal has dramatically improved.

Mr. Petersen noted he like the proposed front elevation, but suggested improving the dormers on the south side by replacing the proposed hip to a gable to match the other sides of the house. Mr. Petersen also felt the mass on the south side should be broken up with maybe a trellis or a deck.

Ms. Plummer asked the Commissioners to decide whether the new roof was too visible at the front elevation.

All agreed it would be appropriate.

Ms. Plummer suggested commenting on the petitioners proposals either in logical decision-making order, or resolving non-controversial issues first, rather than strictly following the order listed.

16. Gutters and downspouts. ARC agreed half-round copper would be appropriate. Mr. Petersen noted that the petitioner could use galvanized steel or aluminum for cost purposes.
9. Move front window on upper level. ARC agreed it would be appropriate.
8. Add new window on second story over porch. ARC agreed that it would be appropriate to add a window to the right, however; the original left window should not be replaced and they would like to see a picture of the new window.
6. Switch front door and window on front porch. Mr. Petersen commented that he is against moving the door, however; the window could be moved. The ARC agreed against moving the door. The ARC agreed the petitioner could replace the window to the right of the front door with one of the existing windows.
5. Replace front door. Ms. Plummer asked if the existing door is an original door. ARC agreed that the petitioner could replace the front door, however; the new door must be made of wood and be compatible with the house.
11. Remove stucco from house. The ARC agreed that the stucco could be removed and replaced with a 3 1/2" to 4" inch exposure for cedar lap siding. Partial shingling in a Folk or Craftsman interpretation may be appropriate but must be submitted for review. No dentils or Colonial or Victorian-style materials/details to be used.
1. Trellis between the house and garage. ARC agreed the trellis is appropriate to hang from the house; however the style and a section should be submitted for review. The style should match the brackets in the front.
2. Remove garage siding. The garage siding may have the same or different exposure as the house. No dentils.
3. Garage door. Since the garage is considered non-contributing, the materials should simply look similar to the house. The ARC agreed a steel door with or without wood veneers would be appropriate, however; it should be painted to look similar to the original structure (no faux grain). The Commission also suggested sixteen (16) windows on top with no cross-bar or diagonal panels to be added. A sample should be submitted for review.
4. Front posts on front porch. The panels shown in the lower portions are not appropriate. The ARC suggested using two tapered square columns; however, they would like the columns to be more substantial.
7. Porch details. The existing eave brackets are acceptable. No dentils. Shingles in the gable field are okay. For removal of the existing ceiling bead board, ARC asked the petitioner to submit a cross-section showing the existing condition and why it is necessary to remove the bead board to perform repairs. Staff will meet with the petitioner at the site for an assessment.
15. Frieze and Dentils. The ARC approved the proposed frieze board; however, the petitioner should remove the dentils.
12. Roof over dining room. The ARC agreed that the siding and copper roof would be appropriate, but the hip roof would not necessarily be appropriate to the style of the original house and addition.
13. Build roof over addition. The ARC approved of the overall massing on the addition; however, not on the northwest corner. Hip roof in rear should be a gable.

14. Wood shingles on gables. Appropriate.
15. Dentils. No dentils; angled soffits preferred; fascia should match (vertical). Rake crown okay, but ARC requested a detail for the proposed crowns.
18. Trellis at rear balcony. The ARC agreed it would be appropriate as long as it matched the style of the house.
19. Remove and replace 6 original windows. The Commission denied the request to remove the 6 original windows, except for the north window which will be removed and relocated to the front.

Additionally: the rear cantilever should have brackets, which should be spaced closely enough to give it apparent support. A trellis in this area would eliminate the need for brackets.

Mr. Plummer asked if the petitioner had additional questions.

Mr. Marchan replied no.

**ARC 05-10** 207 W. Station Street (Residence Status)  
**Petitioner:** Carl Schatsick, owner

Mr. Wallace noted asked the Commissioners who visited the site if they felt the garage could be removed.

Mr. O'Donnell felt that the garage should be demolished.

The ARC unanimously voted that the petitioner could demolish the existing garage.

Mr. Wallace noted that the petitioner will meet at the September 22, 2005 ARC meeting.

The board took a 5-minute recess.

### ***Proposed Rules for Public Hearing***

Mr. Wallace noted that Chairman Julian and Plan Commission Chair Anna Bush had both made suggestions for improving the proposed order of business in the Proposed Rules for Public Hearings. He asked if other ARC members had additional comments. He stated that the proposed rules will come back after further review by staff and the Village Attorney.

Mr. Wallace advised the Commission on a special meeting will be held in October regarding the new historic district survey. If possible, the design guidelines will also be reviewed and discussed, although it appears that more than one meeting will be necessary for review of everything.

### ***Approval of Minutes***

The commission deferred the approval of the July 28, 2005 minutes.

### ***Planners Report***

Mr. Wallace advised the Commission on past and future cases.

### ***Adjournment***

Mr. O'Donnell motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Troy seconded the motion. Voice vote noted all ayes. The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Emerson  
Recording Secretary

---

Karen Plummer, Acting Chairperson  
Architectural Review Commission